EXHIBIT 12

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Figlio, David" <David.Figlio@Rochester.edu>
Subject: Re: Regarding removal of my students!
Date: September 8, 2023 at 8:16:13 PM EDT
To: "Dias, Liyanagamage" <rdias@rochester.edu>
Cc: "Perucchio, Renato" <rlp@me.rochester.edu>

Dear Ranga,

Thank you for your letter. I will contemplate how best to consider your request.

Best wishes,
David

David Figlio (he/him)
Provost and Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education
University of Rochester

From: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>
Sent: Friday, September 8, 2023 2:52 PM
To: Figlio, David <David.Figlio@Rochester.edu>
Cc: Perucchio, Renato <rlp@me.rochester.edu>
Subject: Regarding removal of my students!

Dear Provost Figlio,

I would like to express my gratitude for taking the time to meet with me the other day to discuss the matter regarding the removal of my students. Please find the attached letter regarding your recommendation that I engage in a conversation with Dean Heinzelman.

Regards,
Ranga

EXHIBIT 13

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

David Figlio
Provost and Chief Academic Officer
Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education

UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER

September 18, 2023

Professor Ranga Dias
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627

Dear Professor Dias:

Thank you for meeting with me on September 6, 2023, and for your letter of September 8, 2023, detailing your grievance against Dean Wendi Heinzelman dated August 7, 2023 and supplemented on August 18, 2023, regarding the handling of graduate students in your lab.

You expressed the concern that graduate students were removed from your lab despite their desire to remain working in your lab. I have looked into this concern, as promised, and have determined that the impetus to leave your lab came from the graduate students themselves, and that the graduate students were asked individually on at least two occasions whether they had any concerns about leaving your lab, and they did not.

Given these findings, I have concluded that the graduate students in fact requested to be reassigned, and were provided with ample opportunity to request to continue working with you, and will not pursue your grievance further.

Best wishes,

David Figlio
Provost and Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education

Cc: Renato Perucchio, Chair, Mechanical Engineering

200 Wallis Hall · Box 270021 · Rochester, NY 14627-0021
585.275.5931 · david.figlio@rochester.edu · www.rochester.edu

EXHIBIT 14

HAJIM
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
& APPLIED SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER

RANGA P. DIAS
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
HOPEMAN ENGINEERING BUILDING, Room 220
P.O. BOX 270132
ROCHESTER, NEWYORK 14627

TEL : (585) 276-4112
FAX : (585) 256-2509
Email: *rdias@rochester.edu*

September 27, 2023

David Figlio
Provost and Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education
University of Rochester
david.figlio@rochester.edu

Re: Grievance

Dear Provost Figlio,

I appreciate your correspondence. While I hold a differing perspective from the determination you have reached, which appears to be at odds with both written and verbal communications I have received, I recognize the University's interest in arriving at such a determination. I wish to furnish you with supplementary information to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the matter in question.

On August 3, 2023, I received an email that confirmed a prior conversation concerning the University's decision to reassign my students. The pertinent excerpts from the email read as follows:

> "I am very sorry that it has come to this but as I said this afternoon, based on what we have learned about practices in your lab, we are very concerned about student mentoring and need to move the students to new advisors to complete their degrees. We will be meeting with each of the students to determine the best path forward for them and can get back to you with answers to some of your questions once we have these meetings."

It is noteworthy that the email explicitly attributes this decision to "we," signifying the University as the entity that reached the conclusion to reassign my students. This aligns precisely with the verbal communication I received earlier on the same day. Notably absent from this communication is any indication of a specific request by any student to discontinue their association with my laboratory or mentorship.

Furthermore, the conspicuous absence of any reference to a student's request for reassignment is underscored by the statement that the University "will be meeting with each of the students," which implies that these meetings had not yet occurred at the time of this communication. Consequently, it is of utmost importance to me that the record accurately reflects these events, even if they were not presented during your investigation into my grievance.

Moreover, and most importantly, the letter I received on August 15th 2023 from Dean Heinzelman, which contained numerous points justifying her decision to remove students, doesn't align with the situation. You were copied on this letter. If a student wished to leave voluntarily, there's no need for an extensive list of justifications to remove all students. Students have the freedom to choose the research group they want to work with, and whether they wish to stay or explore other groups is entirely their decision.

By way of example, last year, one of my graduate students expressed their desire to pursue research in a different group for their Ph.D., and I wholeheartedly supported their decision. I even assisted in recommending them to another faculty member, with whom they are currently working. All my other students are aware of this, and if any of them wished to leave, they would do so independently, without the involvement of any member of the U of R leadership. They could simply discuss their intentions with the department's graduate studies chair.

By means of this communication, I would request you to proceed with my grievance by reviewing the comprehensive evidence. Should you require copies of the aforementioned email exchanges for reference, please do not hesitate to inform me, and I will gladly provide them.

Sincerely,

Ranga Dias

cc: Renato Perucchio
Chair, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Program Director, Archaeology, Technology, and Historical Structures
236 and 415 Hopeman
Rochester, NY 14627
Via Email: rlp@me.rochester.edu

EXHIBIT 15

From: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2023 3:15 PM
To: Figlio, David <David.Figlio@Rochester.edu>; Perucchio, Renato <rlp@me.rochester.edu>
Cc: Taubman, Mark <Mark_Taubman@urmc.rochester.edu>
Subject: Re: Determination regarding your grievance concerning removal of students from your lab

Dear Provost Figlio,

I appreciate your email dated September 27, 2023, confirming the receipt of my email sent on the same date, wherein I provided additional information regarding your ongoing investigation of my grievance. I am pleased to understand that your investigation is continuing, and I await your further instructions. Should you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to inform me.

I am aware that my grievance has been brought to your attention due to the involvement of Dean Wendi Heinzelman, who made the decision to reassign my students without prior notice or discussion with me. As we have discussed in our previous meetings and correspondence, I firmly believe that this decision impinges upon my academic freedom as a tenure track faculty member at the University of Rochester. Consequently, I kindly request the involvement of the Faculty Grievance Committee in this matter, as I believe it is appropriate given the circumstances.

Out of an abundance of caution and to ensure clarity in procedures, I have also copied the Senior Vice President of Health Sciences at the University of Rochester on this email, as per the general

grievance procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook. I have attached relevant documentation for your reference.

Please inform me if there are any additional steps or actions required from my end before you conclude your investigation into my grievance. I am grateful for your attention to this matter and appreciate your thorough consideration.

Regards,
Ranga

From: Figlio, David <David.Figlio@Rochester.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2023 3:32 PM
To: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>; Perucchio, Renato <rlp@me.rochester.edu>
Subject: Re: Determination regarding your grievance concerning removal of students from your lab

Dear Ranga,

Thanks for your response. I will be in touch if I need additional information from you.

All the best,
David

David Figlio (he/him)
Provost and Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education
University of Rochester

From: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2023 2:55 PM
To: Figlio, David <David.Figlio@Rochester.edu>; Perucchio, Renato <rlp@me.rochester.edu>
Subject: Re: Determination regarding your grievance concerning removal of students from your lab

Dear Provost Figlio,

Please find attached my response to the letter that I received on September 18th, 2023.

Regards,
Ranga

From: Figlio, David <David.Figlio@Rochester.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 1:59 PM
To: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>; Perucchio, Renato <rlp@me.rochester.edu>
Subject: Determination regarding your grievance concerning removal of students from your lab

Dear Ranga,

I have had the opportunity to look into your grievance regarding the removal of students from your lab. Please see my attached determination letter.

Best wishes,
David

David Figlio (he/him)
Provost and Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education
University of Rochester

--

Ranga P. Dias

School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and
Department of Physics and Astronomy
220 Hopeman Building
University of Rochester

Rochester, NY 14627
Cell:(509) 270 2178Work:(585) 276 4112

Email: rdias@rochester.edu

Website: http://labsites.rochester.edu/dias/

EXHIBIT 16

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Mcfarland, Kevin" <kevin@rochester.edu>
Subject: Re: your request for a faculty grievance hearing
Date: October 4, 2023 at 11:21:04 PM EDT
To: "Dias, Liyanagamage" <rdias@rochester.edu>
Cc: "Perucchio, Renato" <rlp@me.rochester.edu>

Hello Ranga,

Thanks for explaining the situation. Our determination about whether or not your grievance involves a violation of your academic freedom can certainly wait until you have time to respond.

With regards to that determination, I want to assure you that we have not yet reached any conclusion. We are asking for your thoughts before we do so.

The section of the handbook describing the grievance process contains an extensive discussion of what constitutes academic freedom. I would start there.

Best,
Kevin

****

Kevin McFarland (he/him/his)

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

and Steven Chu Professor in Physics

Department of Physics and Astronomy

RC Box 270171

University of Rochester

Rochester, NY 14627 USA

Office: Bausch & Lomb 416; +1-585-275-7076

Fax +1-585-275-3237

****

sent from a University of Rochester email server

From: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 8:24:32 PM
To: Mcfarland, Kevin <kevin@rochester.edu>
Cc: Perucchio, Renato <rlp@me.rochester.edu>
Subject: Re: your request for a faculty grievance hearing

Dear Kevin,

I acknowledge receipt of your email and your request for a formal response regarding the Faculty Handbook and the determination made concerning my "academic freedom" in light of the unilateral decision to reassign all my students, thereby terminating my research and advisory responsibilities at the University. I am grateful for the opportunity to address this matter.

At present, my wife and I are anticipating the arrival of our next child, expected any day now. Despite this, I assure you that I will commence work on this response promptly. I kindly ask for your understanding and patience as I prepare a thorough reply in the coming days. Your consideration in granting me this time is greatly appreciated.

Additionally, if there are specific sections within the Faculty Handbook upon which you and Provost Figlio have based your determination that my grievance is of a "general" nature and does not pertain to my "academic freedom," I kindly request that you direct me to those pertinent provisions. Your assistance in clarifying this matter will be appreciated.

Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.

Regards,
Ranga

From: Mcfarland, Kevin <kevin@rochester.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 3:50 PM
To: Dias, Liyanagamage <rdias@rochester.edu>
Subject: your request for a faculty grievance hearing

Hello Ranga,

Provost Figlio asked me to reach out to you on his behalf in my role as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

According to the Faculty Handbook your "general" grievance will only receive a hearing from a Faculty Grievance Committee if the grievance "involves infringement of academic freedom". The University Committee on Tenure and Privileges (UCTP) and Provost Figlio are jointly charged with determining whether your grievance does relate to academic freedom.

Provost Figlio and I have reviewed your request for a hearing, and concluded that it currently does not make clear how academic freedom, as defined in the Handbook, is involved. To assist us and the UCTP in the task, could you please prepare a letter explaining the relationship of your grievance to infringement of your academic freedom? Feel free to reference my solicitation of such a letter in your response.

Please address the letter to Provost Figlio. I'd be grateful to receive your response in CC. The letter, like your grievance letter and your request for a hearing, will be shared with the UCTP to assist them in their determination.

I hope you'll forgive the informal letter, coupled with a request for a formal response. It was the most expedient way to proceed.

Please acknowledge receipt of this request as well. Thank you.

Best,
Kevin

****
Kevin McFarland (he/him/his)
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
and Steven Chu Professor in Physics

Department of Physics and Astronomy
RC Box 270171
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627 USA

Office: Bausch & Lomb 416; +1-585-275-7076
Fax +1-585-275-3237
****
sent from a University of Rochester email server

EXHIBIT 17

HAJIM
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
& APPLIED SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER

RANGA P. DIAS
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
HOPEMAN ENGINEERING BUILDING, Room 220
P.O. BOX 270132
ROCHESTER, NEWYORK 14627

TEL : (585) 276-4112
FAX : (585) 256-2509
Email: *rdias@rochester.edu*

October 10, 2023

Via Email: david.figlio@rochester.edu
David Figlio
Provost and Gordon Fyfe Professor of Economics and Education
University of Rochester

Re: Grievance and Infringement of Academic Freedom

Dear Provost Figlio,

Thank you for your patience in allowing me some time to respond to Vice Provost McFarland's October 4, 2023 email communications considering my expectant new family member. In Vice Provost McFarland's email, he requested that I provide you with information regarding how my grievance relates to "academic freedom" as defined in the Faculty Handbook. This correspondence is intended to provide you with such information.

I want to first note my understanding that my grievance has been categorized as a "General Grievance" as defined in the Faculty Handbook because it is not directly related to "tenure and appointment" and it is not directly related to "discrimination or harassment on the grounds of sex, race, age, national origin, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or gender identity" as set forth in the Faculty Handbook. Instead, my grievance has been categorized as involving "… teaching loads, office space, real and potential conflicts of interest, ***and the like***" (emphasis added).

Having been categorized as a General Grievance, it appears that you have not yet recognized that the unilateral decision by the Dean to eliminate all my current research and advisor responsibilities by reassigning all my students is directly related to my academic freedom. As such, to date, my General Grievance has been administered through the process identified on pages 41-42 of the Faculty Handbook that permits the General Grievance to be terminated at the provost level without any involvement of a Faculty Grievance Committee. I am a little concerned about this process because you concluded your investigation with a finding that the students made the decision to be reassigned while the Dean confirmed to me in person and in writing that she made the decision to reassign all my students. I refer to my September 27, 2023 communication to you.

In any event, I understand now that in response to my request that my General Grievance by referred to a Faculty Grievance Committee, the Provost's office and the University Committee on Tenure and Privileges (UCTP) must decide whether my General Grievance involves the infringement of academic freedom such that the involvement of a Faculty Grievance Committee is warranted. I have reviewed the Faculty Handbook as well as the *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* adopted by the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC) in 1940 as these were further interpreted by a joint committee of those associations in 1970.

In attempting to help you and the UCTP better understand how the unilateral decision by the Dean to reassign all of my students without any consultation or communication with me until after the fact has impinged my academic freedom, it is important to recognize and accept the Dean's own admission and acknowledgement that she made the decision and she implemented her decision by telling the students that they were being reassigned. See my September 27, 2023 letter to you. By accepting the Dean's own words in this regard, we necessarily must respectfully not accept your conclusion that the students requested to be reassigned. It is with trepidation and concern for being retaliated against by rejecting my General Grievance that I must respectfully disagree with your conclusion. Once we acknowledge the Dean's unilateral decision to reassign all my students without any consultation or communication with me until after she made her decision, we can assess how that decision infringed on my academic freedom as a tenure-track faculty member.

Academic freedom, as defined by the *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* adopted by the AAUP and the AAC in 1940, and interpreted by a joint committee in 1970, encompasses the free exchange of ideas, the pursuit of knowledge, and the opportunity for faculty members to teach and conduct research without undue interference or censorship. These principles allow faculty members the autonomy to design their courses, select their teaching methods, and create an environment in which students can explore diverse perspectives and engage in critical thinking. The *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* upholds the autonomy and independence of faculty members, recognizing that academics should have the freedom to fulfill their roles as educators and mentors to students.

The Dean's unilateral decision to reassign all my students infringed on my academic freedom in several ways. First, the Dean's unilateral decision interfered with my right to design the content and structure of my teaching and advising courses. By unilaterally deciding to reassign all my students, the Dean undermined my authority in the laboratory, impeding my ability to execute my planned curriculum, and disrupting the academic process. I have been completely censored and disciplined in this regard. Such censorship and discipline are contrary to an express tenet of the *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* adopted by the AAUP and the AAC.

Second, the Dean's unilateral decision interfered with my right to choose my teaching and advising methods based on my expertise and pedagogical philosophy. Reassigning all my students appears to be intended to compel me to adapt other teaching and advising methods that conform to the Dean's teaching and advising philosophy, thereby limiting my ability to teach and advise students in a manner that I find most effective. Again, I have been completely censored and disciplined in this regard. Such censorship and discipline are contrary to an express tenet of the *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* adopted by the AAUP and the AAC.

Third, the Dean's unilateral decision eliminated all intellectual diversity in the laboratory in which my students were working. It is well-recognized that diversity is an essential component of academic freedom. Students benefit from exposure to a variety of viewpoints and ideas. The decision to reassign all my students *en masse* not only disrupted, but eliminated the composition of the class, thereby eliminating the diversity of perspectives in the learning environment that I created for the benefit of my students.

Fourth, the Dean's unilateral decision can be seen by other faculty members to create a chilling effect, discouraging faculty members from exploring certain topics or expressing unpopular opinions. Fear of administrative repercussions can stifle academic discourse and hinder the pursuit of knowledge. This is a clear infringement of academic freedom.

Fifth, the Dean's unilateral decision, made without proper consultation with me, violates the principles of procedural fairness and due process, which are integral to upholding academic freedom. As a tenure-track faculty member, I have the right to be involved in decisions that significantly impact my teaching and research activities. Instead of being involved in the process, I have been completely censored and disciplined in this regard. Such censorship and discipline are contrary to an express tenet of the *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* adopted by the AAUP and the AAC.

Sixth, the Dean's unilateral decision eliminated my ability to effectively advise my students on a variety of topics. The *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* emphasizes the importance of faculty independence in teaching. Advising students is an integral part of teaching, involving guidance on academic programs, course selection, career paths, and personal development. Faculty members must have the freedom to provide such guidance based on their expertise and knowledge of their field. I have been denied the ability to provide such guidance to my students.

Seventh, the Dean's unilateral decision has denied me the ability to mentor my students intellectually. Academic freedom allows faculty members to mentor students intellectually. This mentorship goes beyond classroom instruction and involves advising students on research projects, encouraging critical thinking, and fostering intellectual curiosity. This aspect of mentorship aligns with the broader principles of academic freedom outlined in the 1940 Statement. I no longer have this ability because of the Dean's unilateral decision.

Eighth, the Dean's unilateral decision has obliterated my adviser-advisee relationships with my former students. Advising students is essential for supporting their intellectual development. Faculty members, operating under the principles of academic freedom, are empowered to assist students in exploring their interests, refining their goals, and developing the skills and knowledge necessary for their chosen paths. Moreover, the principles of academic freedom implicitly protect the confidential and trusting relationship between students and their academic advisers. Faculty members must be able to advise students openly and honestly, ensuring that students receive guidance that is free from external pressures or censorship. As a result of the Dean's unilateral decision, I no longer have this opportunity.

In summary, the Dean's unilateral decision to reassign all my students infringed on my academic freedom by impeding my ability to shape the course, eliminating my teaching entirely, disrupting intellectual diversity within the group of students, creating a chilling effect, and breaching principles of fundamental fairness and due process. Moreover, the inherent principles of academic freedom encompass my role as an adviser and mentor to my students. Academic freedom grants faculty members the autonomy and independence necessary to fulfill their responsibilities, including advising students in their academic and intellectual pursuits. These actions undermine the core tenets of academic freedom as defined by the joint committee's interpretation of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* as incorporated into our Faculty Handbook. I have been denied these academic freedoms.

Before I close, I feel compelled to address any notion that I can still advise or mentor my former students. The reassignment of my students in the context of all that is going on, has no doubt been perceived by those students as an indication that I have done something wrong. When all my students were reassigned, I have little doubt that it has led to those students and others questioning my competency or behavior. This perception has been damaging to my professional reputation and has created an unwarranted cloud of suspicion. Managing such perceptions and ensuring transparency in the decision-making process should have been a priority to maintain fundamental principles of fairness and due process that underlie the core tenets of academic freedom as defined by the joint committee's interpretation of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* as incorporated into our Faculty Handbook. I have been denied those basic academic freedoms.

By means of this respectful communication, I want to reiterate my concerns about being denied access to a Faculty Grievance Committee in retaliation for my disagreement with your conclusion as well as my assertions that the Dean has denied me certain academic freedoms based on her unilateral decision. As such, I am respectfully requesting that my grievance be appropriately referred to a neutral and independent Faculty Grievance Committee and the procedures for such be followed as set forth in the Faculty Handbook. Should you require any additional information, please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you for your understanding and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ranga Dias

cc: Renato Perucchio
Chair, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Program Director, Archaeology, Technology, and Historical Structures
236 and 415 Hopeman
Rochester, NY 14627
Via Email: rlp@me.rochester.edu

Kevin McFarland
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
and Steven Chu Professor in Physics
Department of Physics and Astronomy
RC Box 270171
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627 USA
Via Email: kevin@rochester.edu

EXHIBIT 18

HAJIM
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
& APPLIED SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER

RANGA P. DIAS
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
HOPEMAN ENGINEERING BUILDING, Room 220
P.O. BOX 270132
ROCHESTER, NEWYORK 14627

TEL : (585) 276-4112
FAX : (585) 256-2509
Email: *rdias@rochester.edu*

October 20, 2023

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Hani Awad via Email: hani_awad@urmc.rochester.edu
Mary Carey via Email: Mary_Carey@urmc.rochester.edu
Gerald Gamm via Email: gerald.gamm@rochester.edu
Thomas Gibson via Email: thomas.gibson@rochester.edu
Joanne Larson via Email: jlarson@warner.rochester.edu
Jeffrey McCune, Co-Chair via Email: jmccune@ur.rochester.edu
Deborah Rossen-Knill via Email: deb.rossen-knill@rochester.edu
Masumi Rostad, Co-Chair via Email: mrostad@esm.rochester.edu

Re: Academic Freedom Concerns

Dear Members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee,

I hope this message finds you in good health. I am writing to seek your guidance and support concerning the unilateral decision to reassign all my students to different advisors which affects my academic freedom as a tenure-track faculty member at the University of Rochester. Please accept my apologies for reaching out to you in this manner, as I was unable to find specific procedural information online regarding the process to request your assistance.

I am aware of the pivotal role that the Faculty Senate plays in fostering effective communication between the University's various faculties and in facilitating dialogue between the collective faculties and the esteemed leadership of the University, namely the President and the Provost. Understanding the confidential nature of Senate proceedings within the University, I am reaching out to you to share the details of my situation and respectfully request your guidance to ensure the proper observance of my rights as a faculty member on the tenure track.

At present, I have a pending unresolved grievance before the provost's office concerning the removal of my students. Specifically, on August 3, 2023, Dean Wendi Heinzelman of Hajim School made the unilateral decision to reassign all my students to new advisors. I was not provided with any prior notice that this was being contemplated and had no opportunity to be heard. Nor, once the decision was made, was the basis of the decision made known to me. After I raised the issue with the Provost, I was told that the initial investigation by the provost's office was that the students had requested reassignment, despite the prior indication from Dean Heinzelman that it was her decision to reassign the students. Then, for the first time, I was advised of purported complaints that had been reported to Dean Heinzelman. Given the contradiction and obfuscation and given the central role that advising students has to academic freedom, I requested that my grievance be referred to the Faculty Grievance Committee. In response, the provost's office sought

additional information on how the Dean's decision affected my academic freedom. I duly provided this information in my letter dated October 10, 2023, yet have not received a response to date.

I am cognizant that my grievance could be terminated by the provost's office if it is deemed not to involve any infringement of my academic freedom. Considering the Provost's initial attempt to conclude my grievance despite clear evidence to the contrary, I am apprehensive that my case might not receive fair consideration. Therefore, I kindly seek your assistance in ensuring that my grievance is given appropriate attention through the established procedures of the Faculty Grievance Committee. Enclosed with this correspondence are the pertinent documents related to my pending grievance for your reference, specifically my October 10, 2023, letter identifying the infringement of my academic freedom.

I sincerely appreciate your time and attention to this matter. Your support in this endeavor is invaluable, and I am hopeful that with your assistance, my grievance will be addressed equitably. Please feel free to contact me if you require any additional information or clarification.

Sincerely,

Ranga Dias

Enclosures

cc: Renato Perucchio
Chair, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Program Director, Archaeology, Technology, and Historical Structures
236 and 415 Hopeman
Rochester, NY 14627
Via Email: rlp@me.rochester.edu